

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not allow.

Sri D. M. SIDDAI AH (Biligere).—On a point of order, Sir. I am bringing to your kind notice whether Call Attention Motion can be discussed in this House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಚ್. ಜಯಪ್ರಕಾಶ್‌ನಾರಾಯಣ (ಸಿಸಿಫ).—ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ  
ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಇದೆ. \* \* \*

Sri V. N. PATIL.—The hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that he was asked the Deputy Commissioner to make enquiry and submit a report. I want to ask the Minister whether it is possible to complete the enquiry in a just and fair way when the police officer is going with revolver in hand and threatening the people not to give the evidence. Should we not believe the statement of hon'ble members who are saying so here? The only course is, the police officer may immediately be transferred from that place to create proper atmosphere for an impartial enquiry.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—To make the enquiry more impartial and also smooth, Government will take every possible step to see that there is no harassment. On the other hand, those who give evidence or appear before the Enquiry, Officer may freely go and give evidence; arrangements will be made. I share the anxiety of the hon'ble members and I will try to see what best can be done.

## PRESENTATION OF PETITION

### Re: WATER SUPPLY SCHEME TO GADAG-BETAGERI

Sri K. H. PATIL (Gadag).—Sir, I present a petition submitted by Shri P. L. Patil and 142 others regarding the abandonment of the proposed water supply scheme to the City of Gadag-Betageri.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Petition is presented.

## NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION BY SRI M. S. KRISHNAN

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್ (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನೂ ಸಹಾ ಒಂದು ವಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದು ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ತಾನ್ ಏರ್‌ಕ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಭಾರತ್ ಅರ್ಸ್ ಮೂವರ್ಸ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್‌ನ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ನನಗೆ ಈಗ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ಉತ್ತರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದ ವಿಷಯವೇ ಒಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿರುವುದೇ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು. ನಾನು ರಾಕ್‌ಬೆಟ್‌ವಿಷಯ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಸ್ಟ್ರೈಕ್ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಯಾವ ಸಂಬಂಧವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಮೇಲಿಡೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ 36 ಸಾವಿರ ಜನ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗದೆ ಇದ್ದುದರಿಂದ

\*\*\* Matter expunged as ordered by the Chair.

ಮೊದಲೇ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದಿನದ ಸ್ಟೈಕ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಂತರ ರಾಕ್‌ಬಿಟ್‌ನ್ನು ಆಡಳಿತ ವರ್ಗದವರು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದವುಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವುಗಳ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮೇನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್, ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಹಾಗೂ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ 2 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೆ ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಾಗೇ ಕೊಳೆಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮೊದಲು ನೋಟೀಸನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದಾದನಂತರ ಸ್ಟೈಕ್‌ನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ರೋಪವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ನಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಅಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಅವರು ಇವರಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಇವರು ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಇವರು ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಕ್‌ಬಿಟ್ ಬೇರೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಬೇಕು—ಇವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಧೃಢಧಾರದಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

2-30 P.M.

**Sri D. DEVARAJ URS** (Minister for Animal Husbandry Fisheries, Information and Publicity).—It is true that the responsibility of the State Government is to see that industrial relationship is properly regulated between employees and the employers, although the factors to which reference has been made by the hon'ble member Sri M. S. Krishnan belong to Central Government. In this connection things will be clear, if you will kindly permit me to make a statement.

The representatives of the Joint Consultative Committee of Public Sector Trade Unions, Bangalore came in a procession to Vidhana Soundha on 28th February 1968 and submitted a Memorandum to the Chief Minister. I was also present. The main demand of the workers raised in this Memorandum to the Chief Minister are as follows.—

- (1) Implementation of Central D. A. rates and interim relief of the Engineering Wage Board;
- (2) Reinstatement of discharged employees of B. E. L. and H. A. L.;
- (3) Lock-Out period wages for the period from 24-6-66 to 12-7-66 in B. E. L. and from 17-11-66 to 17-11-66 in H.A.L.
- (4) Withdrawal of Police Cases.

These were the main four demands which had been mentioned in the Memorandum.

The workers have been agitating in all the Central Public Sector Undertakings at Bangalore for the implementation of the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission regarding Dearness Allowance to Central Government Servants. In B. E. L. the State Government have already referred the demand of the workers for linking of D. A. with cost of living index on 14-4-1965 to the Additional Industrial Tribunal. The Additional Industrial Tribunal has given interim Award which has been

(SRI D. DEVARAJ URS)

implemented by the management. In regard to Bharat Earth Movers, Ltd., the demand of the workers for implementing the central rates of D. A. applicable to Central Government servants has been referred for adjudication to the Additional Industrial Tribunal. The case is still pending.

In Hindustan Aeronautics, Ltd., the workers signed a Memorandum of Settlement on 28-1-1967. As per this settlement the workers get *ad hoc* allowances ranging from Rs. 6 to Rs. 9. In I. T. I the dispute regarding implementation of the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission was referred to adjudication on 3-12-1966. The Presiding Officer Additional Industrial Tribunal, has given Award on 22-7-1967 rejecting reference, stating that the recommendations of the Gajendragadkar Commission are not automatically applicable to the workmen of I. T. I., and that even if there was an implied Agreement between the management and the Union with regard to D. A. which could be revised as and when the Central Government did, that Agreement came to a halt with the constitution of the Engineering Wage Board which has been mainly formed for guiding the destinies of the employees in the Engineering Industries.

In H. M. T. the management have signed a Memorandum of Settlement on 22-2-1967 with the recognised Union, H. M. T. Karmika Sangha. As per this Settlement the management agreed to implement Engineering Wage Board Interim recommendations and also Central Rates of D. A. In view of the implementation of Central rates of D. A. in H. M. T., the workers in other Public Sector Undertakings are agitating for the implementation of Central rates of D. A. I promised the workers that I would take up the question with the Government of India.

The second demand is regarding reinstatement of discharged employees in H. A. L. and B. E. L. The dispute regarding dismissal of five employees in H. A. L. has been taken up in conciliation and the Conciliation Proceedings are still going on. As regards dismissal of 9 workers in B. E. L., the management had sought the approval of the action taken by the Industrial Tribunal. The Union has gone on writ on this question to the High Court. The Union requested the Industrial Tribunal to take additional evidence. This request was rejected by the Tribunal and against this order the Union has gone on a Writ to the High Court. Therefore the whole question is *sub judice*.

As regards the payment of wages for the lock-out period in H. A. L. and B. E. L., the workers in B. E. L. have not raised any such demand so far. This shows that the workers themselves are not satisfied about the justness of their demand for the payment of wages for the lock-out period. The lock-out in B. E. L. was consequent to illegal strike by the workers. Similarly in H. A. L. the management had to declare

lock-out when the workers resorted to illegal strike and they also indulged in violence. The workers raised the demand for the payment of wages for the lockout period but the Government rejected this demand for reference to adjudication for the reasons that the workers resorted to illegal strike which necessitated lock-out and a lock-out declared in consequence of an illegal strike cannot be deemed illegal.

The fourth demand is regarding withdrawal of Police Cases which are pending before the Government.

Before any action could be taken by the State Government on the representation of the Joint Consultative Committee of Public Sector Trade Unions, Bangalore, the Committee declared that the workers in all the Public Sector Undertakings will go on a token strike on 1<sup>st</sup> March 1968. Just now the Hon'ble Member Sri M. S. Krishnan was pointing out that the Labour Department did not take up conciliation proceedings before the strike was resorted to. I am sorry to say that the man knowing the procedure with regard to conciliation, should say so. To say that the Department did not take the question of conciliation is wrong because the Government was not at any time given any notice of the intended strike. The strike has been called all on a sudden without giving notice to the Government. No notice of the intended strike was given. I came to know of this intended strike on 16th March 1968 only two days prior. The moment I came to know of it, I contacted the Hon'ble Members Sri M. S. Krishnan and Sri M. C. Narasimhan, who are both on the Joint Consultative Committee. I requested them not to precipitate a strike in view of the fact that the Memorandum was before us and the Government was considering it in all seriousness. In spite of the advice, I am sorry to state, the strike went on. The Labour Department advised the workers not to go on strike as in respect of all Public Sector Undertakings the disputes were pending for adjudication and any strike resorted by the workers would be illegal as per the provisions contained in Section 24 of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Deputy Labour Commissioner advised the representatives of various Unions of the Public Sector Undertakings to desist from going on strike. He also issued a Press Note on 14th March 1968 advising the workers not to go on strike because it was against law and it was illegal. The disputes were pending for adjudication and any resort to strike would be illegal as per the provisions contained in section 24 of the Industrial Disputes Act. In spite of these efforts the workers in H. A. L., B. E. M. L., went on strike on 16th March 1968. In H. A. L. and B. E. M. L. except supervisory staff all the workers observed strike.

In H. A. L., the Hindustan Aeronautics Employees Association issued a bulletin addressed to all the supervisory staff and above on 15th March 1968. In this bulletin, the Union stated, "how long this management could give you and your family police protection? Can they be at your homes?"

(SRI D. DEVARAJ URS)

The management of H A L, B E M L and B E L took action against some of the workers and trade union office bearers for inciting the worker to go on illegal strike and for indulging in violence. They also suspended 14 workers in H A L and 4 in B E M L. The workers in H A L and B E M L have gone on tool-down strike from 25th March 1968. They are demanding that all suspension orders should be withdrawn and that there should be no further disciplinary proceedings against any worker. They are also demanding immediate implementation of central rates of D. A. the tool-down strike continued in H A L and B E M L and from 4th April 1968 the management of H A L and B E M L declared lock-out.

The Commissioner of Labour has been holding continuously discussions with the managements' and workers' representatives. The workers' representatives are willing to call off the tool-down strike and resume work if the managements withdrew suspension orders. They have no objection for continuing enquiries but they want the suspension orders to be withdrawn.

On 2nd April 1968 the management agreed to the following terms of settlement :

" The representatives of the workers express their regrets for the strike and incidents during March 1968 and assure the management that they will in future only resort to constitutional and peaceful means for redressal of their grievances.

In consideration of the above, the management agreed to rescind the suspension orders issued to employees during March 1968 without prejudice to the right for taking appropriate action on merits of each case in respect of the cases where charge-sheets have been issued.

The representatives of the workmen further agreed to call off the strike and to resume work immediately."

I held discussion separately with the managements' and the workers' representatives on 3rd April 1968 and 4th April 1968. The difference between the stands taken by the managements and the workers have narrowed down. There is every possibility of a settlement between the workers and the managements of H A L and B E M L. The Commissioner of Labour is continuing his conciliation talks with the managements and the workers. Yesterday in the evening the Labour Commissioner gave a draft settlement to the management as well as the worker's representatives of H A L after taking their opinions into consideration. The workers agreed in principle to the entire settlement, but they suggested some minor changes. They agreed to express regret for the appeal dated 14th March 1968 and for loss of production. They further stated that if the management agree to these changes, the workers will come and sign it today at 11 A.M. and

that they would formally place the draft settlement before the Executive Committee for their information and approval. They promised the Labour Commissioner that they may be taken as final settlement, if the management agree. The Commissioner of Labour waited for them till now, but they have not turned up. The management came to the Commissioner of Labour and waited till 12-30 P.M. for finalising the settlement. It is unfortunate that the workers' representatives have not kept up their promise so far. The number of workers affected by the lock-out in HAL is 16,600 and in BEML 3,000. This is the latest position.

**Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.**—Sir, since my name has been dragged by the Hon'ble Minister, I request you to permit me to have my say by way of personal explanation. He said that despite the fact that he had contacted Mr. Krishnan and Mr. Narasimhan the strike went on. It is true that he contacted me on the 14th but then it was too late in the day. Since two years they have been agitating and what were they doing during all those two years?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.**—The hon'ble Member must bear in mind that strikes and lock-outs do not form the subject matter of an adjournment motion.

**Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.**—Sir, when you have permitted the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement, you must also permit me to have my say by way of explanation. I do not agree with some of the statements made by the Hon'ble Minister.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.**—The responsibility of the State Government is very limited and I withhold my consent.

**Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.**—That is not very correct. Government cannot shirk their responsibility; they cannot utter half truths here.

## BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1968-69

### Demands for Grants

#### DEMAND No. 17 AND 37

**Sri K. V. SHANKARA GOWDA** (Minister for Education and Agriculture).—Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor, I beg to move :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,17,27,200 including the sums already voted on account be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the financial year for the period ending 31st day of March 1969, in respect of 'Education'.